FHI 059, Version 12		Issued by: FHI	Date of issue: 08/10/2018					
Case No: 2020-0096			Date of visit: 25/02/2020					
Time spent on site:		Main Inspecto	r:					
Site No: FS0301 Business No: FB0169	Site Name: Business Name:	Appleburn Hatchery The Scottish Salmon Company	/					
Case Types: 1 ECI 2	2 CNI 3 VMD	4 5	6					
Water Temp (°C): 2.2	Thermometer No:	T173	FHI 045 completed					
Observations:	Region: HI	Water type: F	CoGP MA					
Dead/weak/abnormally behaving fish present? Clinical signs of disease observed? Gross pathology observed? Diagnostic samples taken? If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet. If yes, see additional information/clinical score sheet.								
UNI/REG only - if unable to carry	out intended visit detai	I reason below:						

Additional Case Information:

Fish had been recently treated with formalin and Cress.

On inspection of the site no clinical signs of disease noted.

FHI 059, Version 12			Issu	ed by: FHI			Date of issu	e: 08/10/2018
Case No:	2020-0096		Site No:	FS0301				
Date of Visit:		25/02/2020			Inspector(s):]
Registration/Authornamental 1. Business/site deta 2. Changes made to	ails summary		site representa	ative?			Y N	
Site Details								
Total No facilities		60	Facilities sto	cked	12	No facilitie	s inspected	60
Species	SAL	SAL						
Age group	2020s1	2020s0						
No Fish	245,000	953,000						
Mean Fish Wt	57g	0.9g						
Next Fallow Date (S	ite)	ongoing cyc	le	Next Input Da	ate (Site)	April 2020		
Recent (last 4 wks)	disease probl	ems?		Y	Any escapes	(since last)	visit)?	N
If yes, detail:	saprolegnia				jy	(======================================	, :	
Movement Records	<u> </u>							
Movement record		r inspection?						Y
2. Date of last inspe		i inopeodori.					21/02/2018	
3. Are records comp		ectly entered	?				0	У
4. Are movement re		•						Ý
5. Are records comp	lete and corr	ectly entered	?					Y
6. Are health certific		•		able?				N/A
Transport Records			·					
Are any movement		t by (or on be	half) of the hu	isiness (not ils	ing a STR)?			N
If yes, is there a sys			•	•	_			N/A
Mortality Records								
Mortality records :	available for i	nspection?						Y
2. How are mortalities		•			Biogas - Ene	rgen. Cumb	ernauld	
If other detail:								
3. Mortality records	complete and	correctly ent	ered?					Y
4. Recent mortality (•	•		%) background	l mortalities			•
5. Evidence of recer	nt increased/a	tvpical morta						N
If yes, facility nos/no		• •		/reason:				
			· · ·					
6. Any other peaks i	n mortality du	ring period cl	hecked?					Y
If yes, detail:		•	/ 11	sfer first feedin	g fry)			
7. Have increased (t	unexplained)	mortalities be	en reported to	vet or FHI?				N/A
If yes, detail action:								
8. Have 'mortality ev	ents' been re	ported to FHI	l? If no, add M	RT case and e	enter on morta	lity events s	heet.	N/A

4. Are fish in a withdrawal period?			У
5. If yes, what treatment(s)?	Formalin	Cress	
If other, detail:			
6. Are medicines stored appropriately?			Y
Piecesurity Peeerde			
Biosecurity Records			
Biosecurity records available for inspection?		for diamonal boom considered Q	y
2. Has the manner and frequency of mortality re		•	У
3. Has the manner and period in which the APB	•	ers or veterinary professional of any	
increased (unexplained) mortality at the site be	en included?		У
4. Has the action that will be taken in the event is detected been included and <i>how</i> and <i>when</i> t		•	У
5. Has the health status of aquaculture animals			V
health status, certification if required)?	being stocked on the ran	If site been covered (equal of higher	<u> </u>
meanin status, certification in required):			
6. Have the husbandry and biosecurity measure	es implemented between	each enidemiological unit to minimise	· ·
transmission of disease been covered (movement	•		,
7. Is documentation available regarding the mea			V
aquaculture animals held on site?	asures in place to mainta	in the physical containment of	,
Have the biosecurity procedures been adequ	ately implemented on site	2	\ \ \
If no, detail:	ately implemented on site	:	,
ii iio, dotaii.			
Results of Surveillance			
1. Has any animal health surveillance been carr	ried out by, or on behalf o	f. the business?	Y
2. If yes, are results available for inspection?	•		Y
3. Any significant results?			Y
or, any organical recentor		samples in July 2019 tested positive for	or
		Flavobacterium psychrophilum and Icl	
If yes, detail (if not detailed under recent diseas	e problems).	necator.	
	,	•	
Decords shooked between	21/02/2019	25/2/2020	

Records checked between: 21/02/2018 - 25/2/2020

	ni 059, version 12							153	ueu by.	ГП			
	Case no:	2020-00	096	Site No:		FS0301			Date of Samplin		25/	02/2020	
	Priority samples:	VI		ВА		PA		MG		HI		l	
	Time sampling starts/ends:	13:0	0:00	13:3	0:00		Inspect	or:			VMD No	o.	4
	Environmental conditions:	1	Indoors	2		3		4		5			
	Summary samples	HIST		BA		MG		VI		PA		Total Sa	amples
A	dd Fish/Pools - click												
	Pool/Fish No												
	Fish nos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Pool Group												
	Species	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL		SAL		SAL	SAL
	Average weight	55g	55g										
	Sex												
	Water Type	FW	FW										
Stock Details		Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit										

	Additional Sample Information:														
0 Total Tests assigned 0															
U		Total I	CS15 a55	igned	U										
								_							
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24				
SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL	SAL				
	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g	55g				
oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog	oog				
E) A /	E144	E147	E147	E14/	E147	E144	EVA/	E VA	E14/	E) A /	E) A (
FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW	FW				
L C	Ľ	Ľ	L	L	L	L	Ę	Ľ	Ë	L	L				
Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit	Appleburn incubation unit	Appleburn incubation Unit				
q	pe	pg	pg	pg	ps	pg	pg	pg	pg	pg	pg				
าว	<u>ਹ</u>	ซ	เร	าว	ซ	ว	ซ	าว	ซ	ซ	ซ				
.⊑	⊒.	.⊑	⊒.	.⊑	.⊑	.⊑	.⊑	_⊆.	.⊑	.⊑	ᆢ				
E	Ξ	E	E	E	5	E	E	E	E	E	E				
nq	ρη	nq	pq	nq	pq	nq	pn	pq	pq	nq	ηq				
<u>0</u>	<u>•</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>•</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>e</u>	<u>e</u>				
Appl unit	Appl Unit	Appl unit	pp	pp	Appl Unit	pp	pp	App unit	Appl Unit	Appl unit	pp				
C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2	C2				

FHI 059, Version 12	Issued by: FHI Date of issue:							
Case Number:	2020-0096		Site	e No:	FS0301		lnsp:	
Date of Visit	25/02/2020		No	of mo	vements/s	upp./dest.		Score
Live fish movements				0	1-5	6-10	>10	
Movements on (from out	Frequency of m	novements on from equivalent MS		0	5	10	14	0
with GB) of susceptible species		novements on from equivalent zone	or	0	9	18	26	0
·	Number of sup	ncluding third country pliers	+	0	5	10	14	0
Movements off	Frequency of m		+	0	3	6	10	10
Wovernerits on	Number of des		+	0	3	6	10	6
Exposure via water		Site conta	icts	0	1-5	6-10		
Water contacts with other farms (holding species	disinfection or l	,		0				
susceptible to same diseases)	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	2	4		1
	farms upstream	or in a coastal zone with category I n or within 1 tidal excursion		1	3	6		Ш
		or in a coastal zone with category \ n or within 1 tidal excursion	/	1	4	8		ш
Management practices			No	ne	Secure	Unsecure		
Water contacts with processors	Any processing	g plant discharging into adjacent wa	ters	0	1	2		0
On farm processing within the rules of the directive	No on farm pro			0				0
	Processing own		1					
	Processing fish	from MS of equivalent status		2				
	Processing fish equivalent state		4					
	•	r from Category III farm		8				
	Processing fish	n from Category ∀ farm		10				\Box
Disposal of fish and fish by-	Site's own was	te only processed.		0				\Box
products	Common proce	esses with other farms		3				3
	Collection poin	t for waste from other farms		5				
Use of unpasteurised feeds	No feeding of u	inpasteurised feed	T	0				0
	Feeding unpas	teurised feed		5				-
Biosecurity		Number of s	ites	1	2 or 3	≥ 4		
Contacts with other sites	Sites operating	from single shorebase		0	1	2		1
	Sites sharing s	taff and equipment		0	1	2		1
Disinfection of equipment	Yes		Т	0				0
between sites, use of footbaths etc	No		_	1				Н
CoGP/Regulator								
Practices in accordance	Yes		T	0				0
with regulator or industry code of practice	No			3				
Platform access to cages	Yes			0				0
	No			2				Ш
						Total Rank		22 MEDIUM

Case No:	2020-0096		Site N	No:	FS0301							
Sea Lice Inspection (Seawater Sites Only) nced sea lice problems	in the previous 4 years	?									
2. Is the CoGP Farm Management Area (or equivalent) fallowed synchronously on a single year class basis?												
3. Does the site have access to a range of licenced in-feed and bath sea lice medications (including deltamethrin, azamethiphos and emamectin benzoate) as well as access to suitable biological and/or mechanical control measures, and can these be deployed in a reasonable period of time? 4. Is there a signed documented farm management agreement or statement relevant to the site and CoGP Farm												
Management Area (or		ment agreement or sta	terrierit relevant to	uie site	e and Coor I ann							
5. Are sea lice count re	5. Are sea lice count records available for inspection? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)											
6. Do records adequately reflect the required standard specified in the SSI and the CoGP? (Legal SSI, CoGP Annex 6)												
7. Are sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) record levels below the suggested criteria for treatment in the CoGP during the period that records are inspected? (CoGP Annex 6)												
8. Have average adult female sea lice (<i>L. salmonis</i>) numbers per fish been at a level of 3 or above (prior to w/b 10/6/19) or 2 or above (from w/b 10/6/19) during the period that records are inspected?												
•	n reported to the Fish He	•										
9. Is C. elongatus infe	station at a level which is	s considered to cause	significant welfare p	probler	ms? (CoGP 4.3.81, 5	.3.50)						
	reatments been adminis reatment or where <i>C. el</i> d											
11. Has any other action	on been taken (where ap	pplicable)?										
12. Have therapeutic t	reatments or the actions	taken had a significan	t impact upon the li	ice leve	els recorded?							
13. Are treatments, wh	ere conducted, carried o	out in cooperation betw	een participating fa	arms?								
sea lice?	ng strategy for the site, w											
	cific written lice manager scalation of a sea lice in		aypoints describing	set ac	tions to deal with rec	ognised						
16. Do the sea lice lev	els observed on stocks r	eflect sea lice count da	ata? If no please de	etail rea	asons.							
Containment Inspect	ion											
•	nced equipment damage	e due to predators in th	e current or previo	us pro	duction cycles?	N						
2. Are measures in pla	ice to mitigate against th	e predation experience	ed on site? (Detail b	below)		Υ						
Covered tanks s	ome tanks indoors											
If other, detail below	:											
3 Have escape incide	ents or events been expe	rienced on or in the vi	rinity of the site sin	ce the	last FHI inspection?	N						
	estions 4 – 9. If No skip		on the one on	100 1110	naot i i i inopeditori.							
	ported to Scottish Minist	•										
5. Have these been re	ported to local DSFB for	thwith (where they exis	t)? (CoGP - 4.4.3	7, 5.4.	17)							
6. Have these been re	ported to the SSPO and	local fisheries trusts fo	orthwith (where they	y exist)	? (CoGP – 4.4.37, 5.4	4.17)						
7. Were methods (if ar	ny) used to recover esca	pees? If yes give detai	I									
O If will contain	and we thin the		lutana ta an									
8. If gill nets were depl Ministers? (Legal, Coo	loyed was this action agr SP – 4.4.38, 5.4.18)	eed with local wild fish	interests and was	permis	ssion given by Scottis	n						
, -	ken to prevent and minin	nise the risk of further e	escapes? (Not cove	ered in	code but could							
be considered unde	r satisfactory measure	es of the Act)										
10. Is the site inspecte	d as satisfactory with re	gards to containment?	If no, please detail	reaso	n(s)	Υ						

Issued by: FHI

Date of issue: 08/10/2018

FHI 059, Version 12

Case No:	2020-0096	Date of visit: 25/02/2020										
Site No:	FS0301	Inspector:										
Results Summary	Freq.			Date of Notification								
		Database	Insp	Phone	Insp	Writing	Insp	2 nd Insp				
Report Summary												
Report Summary Case Type	Date	Insp	2 nd Insp									
ECI,CNI,VMD	11/03/2020		2 insp									
LOI,OIVI,VIVID	11/03/2020											





The Scottish Salmon Company 1 Smithy Lane Lochgilphead Argyll PA31 8TA

FISH HEALTH INSPECTORATE VISIT REPORT

SUMMARY FOR INFORMATION OF SITE OPERATOR

BUSINESS NO FB0169
SITE NO FS0301
INSPECTOR

DATE OF VISIT 25/02/2020
SITE NAME Appleburn Hatchery
CASE NO 20200096

Inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009

The above site was inspected, in accordance with the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009, and to meet the requirements of European Community Council Directive 2006/88/EC.

All epidemiological units were inspected. On this occasion no samples were taken for disease analysis. The Inspector did not observe any clinical signs associated with the listed diseases as described in the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009.

Records

The surveillance frequency category of the site was assessed as medium. An inspection under the Aquatic Animal Health (Scotland) Regulations 2009 will be conducted every second year. The category of the site will be reassessed on a routine basis and updated as required.

The information required for the public record of aquaculture production businesses regarding this site was verified and where necessary updated. The following records were also inspected to ensure that the conditions of authorisation for your Aquaculture Production Business (APB) are being met:

Aquaculture animal and aquaculture animal product movement records were inspected and appeared to be adequately maintained.

Mortality records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

No mortality levels exceeding the reporting criteria have been recorded since the last inspection.

R04

Reports detailing the results of animal health surveillance carried out by or on behalf of the business were available for inspection.

The biosecurity measures plan for the site was inspected and found to be adequately maintained and implemented.

Inspection under the Animals and Animal Products (Examination for Residues and Maximum Residue Limits) (England and Scotland) Regulations 2015

Medicine records were inspected and found to be adequately maintained.

Samples were taken to be analysed for veterinary residues.

Inspection under the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007

The site was also inspected in accordance with the Aquaculture and Fisheries (Scotland) Act 2007 with respect to section 5 regarding containment and escapes.

On this occasion the site was found to be satisfactory.

Please contact myself or the duty inspector should you require any further information or have any queries regarding this report.

Signed: Date: 11/03/2020
Fish Health Inspector

The Fish Health Inspectorate Service Charter detailing standards of service is available on the Marine Scotland website at www.gov.scot/Topics/marine/Fish-Shellfish/FHI/charter